

Mini-superspace models in Histories Theory

Charis Anastopoulos*

Department of Physics, University of Patras, 26500 Patras, Greece

and

Ntina Savvidou †

Department of Physics, University of Patras, 26500 Patras, Greece

and

Theoretical Physics Group, Imperial College, SW7 2BZ, London, UK

February 7, 2008

Abstract

We study the Robertson-Walker minisuperspace model in histories theory, motivated by the results that emerged from the histories approach to general relativity. We examine, in particular, the issue of time-reparameterisation in such systems. The model is quantised using an adaptation of reduced-state-space quantisation. We finally discuss the classical limit, the implementation of initial cosmological conditions and estimation of probabilities in the histories context.

1 Introduction

The Robertson-Walker model provides the standard paradigm for modern cosmology since it incorporates the symmetries of spatial homogeneity and isotropy in the solution of Einstein equations. In cosmology the R-W model appears as a classical dynamical system, that it is described by the scale factor and by spatially averaged matter field variables.

In spite of the success of the R-W model at the classical level, there has been a strong effort to study the quantisation of this, as well as other cosmological models, motivated by their role in the search for a quantum gravity theory.

Such models allow us to probe the early—Planck length—stages of the Universe. In spite of the absence of a full theory of quantum gravity they allow a testing ground for hypotheses about the initial condition of the Universe, the emergence of classical spacetime and the plausibility of the special initial conditions for inflation.

*anastop@physics.upatras.gr

†ntina@imperial.ac.uk

‘Minisuperspace’ models are very simple systems, as they have been divested of much of the symmetry of general relativity, still they provide non-trivial examples in which quantum gravity programmes may apply their ideas and techniques. They are particularly relevant for the discussion of major conceptual issues of quantum gravity such as the problem of time, the construction of reparameterisation-invariant physical observables and the physical interpretation of the Hamiltonian constraint.

In this work we study the quantisation of minisuperspace models within the context of the Histories Projection Operator formalism, in light of the significant results emerged from the histories approach to general relativity[1, 2].

The (HPO) histories formalism is a continuation of the consistent histories theory developed by Griffiths, Omnès, Gell-Mann and Hartle—for reviews see [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The fundamental object in this formalism is the *history*, which is defined as a time-ordered sequence of propositions about properties of a physical system. When a certain ‘decoherence condition’ is satisfied by a set of histories then the elements of this set *can* be given probabilities. The probability information of the theory is encoded in the decoherence functional, a complex function of pairs of histories.

The importance of the histories scheme for quantum gravity is that histories are objects that are intrinsically temporal, namely they incorporate in their definition the notion of causal ordering. This is very desirable for a theory of quantising gravity, where the loss of time at the space of true degrees of freedom—the problem of time [8, 9]—is considered as one of the main conceptual problems. Indeed, the development of the histories formalism in the Histories Projection Operator scheme [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15], has led to a quantisation algorithm for parameterised systems [16] in which the histories causal ordering is preserved on the space of true degrees of freedom.

Of great importance in the development of the histories scheme is the construction of a classical histories theory [14]. The basic mathematical entity is the space of differentiable paths taking their value in the space Γ of classical states. The key idea in this new approach to classical histories is contained in the symplectic structure on this space of temporal paths. Analogous to the quantum case, there are generators for two types of time transformation: one associated with classical temporal logic, and one with classical dynamics. One significant feature is that the paths corresponding to solutions of the classical equations of motion are determined by the requirement that they remain invariant *under the symplectic transformations generated by the action*[14].

The strongest motivation for the study of minisuperspace models within the histories theory comes from its application at the level of general relativity from where two important results arise. First, the spacetime diffeomorphism group coexists with the ‘group’ generated by the history version of the canonical constraints [17, 1]. The constraints, however, depend on a choice of foliation for the 3+1 splitting of spacetime. This leads to the important question whether physical results depend upon this choice. The solution of the constraints determines a reduced phase space for histories, which has an explicit dependence on

the foliation. It turns out that *space-time diffeomorphisms intertwine between different such reductions*[2]. This is a completely novel result, which has been made possible only by the incorporation of general relativity into the histories formalism.

The results above suggest that a scheme for the quantisation of gravity based on histories has two highly desirable features[2].

First, the Lorentzian metric can be directly quantised; this contrasts with conventional canonical quantum gravity where only a spatial three-metric is quantised.

Second, the history scheme incorporates general covariance via a manifest representation of the space-time diffeomorphism group.

Even though minisuperspace models lack the most fundamental feature of general relativity—general covariance—, they still provide an important testing ground of ideas and techniques for a quantum gravity programme. The construction of a Hilbert space of histories, the implementation of the constraints and the identification of gauge invariant physical observables are highly non-trivial procedures even in the simplest of minisuperspace models—for other studies of minisuperspace models in the framework of consistent histories see [18] . As such they sharpen our understanding about the issues involved and allow us to distinguish between the deep conceptual problems and the ones that are of a purely technical nature.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In the next section we provide a concise description of the classical histories theory, emphasising the insights obtained by the incorporation of general relativity into the histories programme.

In section 3, we study the classical histories theory for an R-W cosmological model with a scalar field. We identify the histories reduced state space for various values of the relevant parameters. We place strong emphasis in the notion of time-reparameterisations for this system, as it is the only remnant of the spacetime diffeomorphism invariance in the minisuperspace model. We note that in some cases the histories reduced state space has the structure of an orbifold—it is not a globally smooth manifold.

In section 4, we describe the construction of the history Hilbert space and the decoherence functional for cosmological models. Starting from previous results we discuss the issue of finding a representation of the theory when the Hamiltonian does not possess a vacuum state. Such is the case of minisuperspace models for which the Hamiltonian constraint does not have a continuous spectrum around zero. We analyse the difference in physical predictions entailed by the choice of different representations.

An important feature of the construction of the histories Hilbert space is that it strongly relies on the identification of a set of canonical coherent states. For this reason we analyse the implementation of the constraints at the coherent states level.

In section 5, after a brief discussion of Dirac quantisation in the histories setting [16], we suggest that the most adequate method of implementing the constraints at the quantum level is a version of reduced state space quantisation.

We analyse this procedure in detail and we construct the canonical coherent states for the reduced system.

In section 6 we explicitly construct the full history Hilbert space, and identify the physical history Hilbert space. We then write the decoherence functional for the true degrees of freedom. We expand on the issue of the initial condition and the emergence of classical spacetime. We examine how the 'tunnelling' initial condition [19] may be implemented in the histories scheme, providing an estimation of the tunnelling probability. Finally we discuss the extensions of the formalism involved in a rigorous treatment of the non-boundary proposal [20] in the histories framework.

2 Background

2.1 Classical Histories

In the consistent histories formalism, a history $\alpha = (\hat{\alpha}_{t_1}, \hat{\alpha}_{t_2}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{t_n})$ is defined to be a collection of projection operators $\hat{\alpha}_{t_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, each of which represents a property of the system at the single time t_i . Therefore, the emphasis is placed on histories, rather than properties at a single time, which in turn gives rise to the possibility of generalized histories with novel concepts of time.

The HPO approach, places particular emphasis on temporal logic. This is achieved by representing the history α as the operator $\hat{\alpha} := \hat{\alpha}_{t_1} \otimes \hat{\alpha}_{t_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{\alpha}_{t_n}$ which is a genuine *projection* operator on the tensor product $\otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_{t_i}$ of copies of the standard Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

The space of classical histories $\Pi = \{\gamma \mid \gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Gamma\}$ is the set of all smooth paths on the classical state space Γ . It can be equipped with a natural symplectic structure, which gives rise to the Poisson bracket. For the simple case of a particle at a line

$$\{x_t, x_{t'}\}_\Pi = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

$$\{p_t, p_{t'}\}_\Pi = 0 \quad (2.2)$$

$$\{x_t, p_{t'}\}_\Pi = \delta(t - t') \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$x_t : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\gamma \mapsto x_t(\gamma) := x(\gamma(t)) \quad (2.5)$$

and similarly for p_t .

One may define the Liouville function

$$V(\gamma) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt p_t \dot{x}_t, \quad (2.6)$$

which generates symplectic transformations of the form $(x_t, p_t) \rightarrow (x_{t+s}, p_{t+s})$; also the Hamiltonian (*i.e.*, time-averaged energy) function H

$$H(\gamma) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt h_t(x_t, p_t) \quad (2.7)$$

where h_t is the Hamiltonian that is associated with the copy Γ_t of the normal classical state space with the same time label t .

The history equivalent of the classical equations of motion is given by the following condition[14] that holds for *all* functions F on Π when γ_{cl} is a classical solution:

$$\{F, S\}_{\Pi}(\gamma_{cl}) = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$S(\gamma) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt (p_t \dot{x}_t - H_t(x_t, p_t)) = V(\gamma) - H(\gamma) \quad (2.9)$$

is the classical analogue of the action operator [14].

Classical parameterised systems. Parameterised systems have a vanishing Hamiltonian $H = h(x, p)$, when the constraints are imposed. Classically, two points of the constraint surface C correspond to the same physical state if they are related by a transformation generated by the constraint. The true degrees of freedom correspond to equivalence classes of such points and are represented by points of the reduced state space Γ_{red} .

In the histories approach to parameterised systems, the history constraint surface C_h is defined as the set of all smooth paths from the real line to the constraint surface C . The history Hamiltonian constraint is defined by $H_{\kappa} = \int dt \kappa(t) h_t$, where $h_t := h(x_t, p_t)$ is first-class constraint. For all values of the smearing function $\kappa(t)$, the history Hamiltonian constraint H_{κ} generates canonical transformations on the history constraint surface C_h . The history reduced state space Π_{red} is then defined as the set of all smooth paths on the canonical reduced state space Γ_{red} , and it is identical to the space of orbits of H_{κ} on C_h .

In order for a function on the full state space, Π , to be a physical observable (*i.e.*, to be projectable into a function on Π_{red}), it is necessary and sufficient that it commutes with the constraints on the constraint surface.

Contrary to the canonical treatments of parameterised systems, the classical equations of motion are explicitly realised on the reduced state space Π_{red} . They are given by

$$\{\tilde{S}, F\}(\gamma_{cl}) = \{\tilde{V}, F\}(\gamma_{cl}) = 0 \quad (2.10)$$

where $\tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{V}$ are respectively the action and Liouville functions projected on Π_{red} . Both $\tilde{S}$ and $\tilde{V}$ commute weakly with the Hamiltonian constraint [16].

2.2 Histories general relativity

We will next describe the incorporation of classical general relativity into the histories framework [1, 2].

We consider a four-dimensional manifold M , which has the topology $\mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$. The history space is defined as $\Pi^{cov} = T^* \text{LRiem}(M)$, where $\text{LRiem}(M)$ is the space of all Lorentzian four-metrics $g_{\mu\nu}$, and $T^* \text{LRiem}(M)$ is its cotangent bundle. Hence, the history space Π^{cov} for general relativity is the space of all histories $(g_{\mu\nu}, \pi^{\mu\nu})$.

The history space Π^{cov} is equipped with the symplectic form

$$\Omega = \int d^4 X \, \delta \pi^{\mu\nu}(X) \wedge \delta g_{\mu\nu}(X), \quad (2.11)$$

where X is a point in the spacetime M , and where $g_{\mu\nu}(X)$ is a four-metric that belongs to the space of Lorentzian metrics $LRiem(M)$, and $\pi^{\mu\nu}(X)$ is the conjugate variable.

The symplectic structure Eq. (2.11) generates the following covariant Poisson brackets algebra, on the history space Π^{cov}

$$\{g_{\mu\nu}(X), g_{\alpha\beta}(X')\} = 0 \quad (2.12)$$

$$\{\pi^{\mu\nu}(X), \pi^{\alpha\beta}(X')\} = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

$$\{g_{\mu\nu}(X), \pi^{\alpha\beta}(X')\} = \delta_{(\mu\nu)}^{\alpha\beta} \delta^4(X, X'), \quad (2.14)$$

where $\delta_{(\mu\nu)}^{\alpha\beta} := \frac{1}{2}(\delta_\mu^\alpha \delta_\nu^\beta + \delta_\mu^\beta \delta_\nu^\alpha)$.

We define the Liouville function V_W associated with any vector field W on M as

$$V_W := \int d^4 X \, \pi^{\mu\nu}(X) \mathcal{L}_W g_{\mu\nu}(X) \quad (2.15)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_W$ denotes the Lie derivative with respect to W .

These functions V_W , defined for any vector field W as in Eq. (2.15), satisfy the Lie algebra of the *spacetime diffeomorphisms group* $\text{Diff}(M)$:

$$\{V_{W_1}, V_{W_2}\} = V_{[W_1, W_2]}, \quad (2.16)$$

where $[W_1, W_2]$ is the Lie bracket between vector fields W_1 and W_2 on the manifold M .

We next introduce a $3+1$ foliation of the spacetime M , which is spacelike with respect to a Lorentzian metric g , in order to construct a $3+1$ description of the theory. However, a key feature of the present construction is that this foliation is required to be *four-metric dependent* in order to address the key issue of requiring all the different choices of foliation to be spacelike.

For each $g \in LRiem(M)$ we choose a spacelike foliation $\mathcal{E}[g]$. For a given Lorentzian metric g , we use the foliation $\mathcal{E}[g]$ to split g with respect to the Riemannian three-metric h_{ij} , the lapse function N and the shift vector N^i as

$$h_{ij}(t, \underline{x}; g) := \mathcal{E}_{,i}^\mu(t, \underline{x}; g) \mathcal{E}_{,j}^\nu(t, \underline{x}; g) g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{E}(t, \underline{x}; g)) \quad (2.17)$$

$$N_i(t, \underline{x}; g) := \mathcal{E}_{,i}^\mu(t, \underline{x}; g) \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\nu(t, \underline{x}; g) g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{E}(t, \underline{x}; g)) \quad (2.18)$$

$$-N^2(t, \underline{x}; g) := \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\mu(t, \underline{x}; g) \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\nu(t, \underline{x}; g) g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{E}(t, \underline{x}; g)) - N_i N^i(t, \underline{x}) \quad (2.19)$$

Detailed calculations show that the symplectic form Ω can be written in the equivalent canonical form, with respect to a chosen foliation functional $\mathcal{E}$

$$\Omega = \int \int d^3 x \, dt (\delta \pi^{ij} \wedge \delta h_{ij} + \delta p \wedge \delta N + \delta p_i \wedge \delta N^i), \quad (2.20)$$

where the momenta have been suitably defined in terms of $\pi^{\mu\nu}$ and the foliation-functional.

One then define the history version of the canonical constraints which satisfy a histories version of the Dirac algebra [17, 1].

To summarise, the relation between the spacetime diffeomorphism algebra, and the Dirac constraint algebra has long been an important matter for discussion in quantum gravity. Therefore it is of great significance that, in this new construction, the two algebras appear together in an explicit way: the classical theory contains realisations of both the space-time diffeomorphism group *and* the Dirac algebra.

Furthermore the canonical constraints can be straightforwardly written using the paths of canonical metric and momenta. This is a very significant result: it implies that there is a central role for *spacetime* concepts, as opposed to the domination by spatial ideas in the normal canonical approaches to quantum gravity.

The constraints, however, depend on the foliation functional. This leads to the important question whether physical results depend upon this choice. The solution of the constraints determines a reduced phase space for histories, which has an explicit dependence on the foliation. It is proved the critical result that *space-time diffeomorphisms intertwine between different such reductions*. This is a completely novel result, which has been made possible only by the incorporation of general relativity into the histories formalism.

In particular, the spacetime diffeomorphisms generated by V_W commute with the constraints if the foliation functional satisfies the equivariance condition: For a function $\mathcal{E} : \text{LRiem}(M) \rightarrow \text{Fol}(M)$, (where $\text{LRiem}(M)$ is the space of Lorentzian metrics on M , and $\text{Fol}(M)$ is the space of foliations of M) we say that $\mathcal{E}$ is an ‘equivariant foliation’ if

$$\mathcal{E}(f^*g) = f^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}(g), \quad (2. 21)$$

for all Lorentzian metrics g and spacetime diffeomorphisms $f \in \text{Diff}(M)$.

3 Classical histories minisuperspace model

3.1 The Robertson-Walker model

We study the reduction of the full general relativity histories theory to a homogeneous and isotropic cosmological model with a scalar field.

Our starting point is a configuration space containing the Lorentzian metric $g_{\mu\nu}(X)$ and the scalar field $\Phi(X)$. The history state space Π_{cov} is the cotangent bundle over the configuration space $\Pi_{RW} = T^*[\text{LRiem}(M) \times C^\infty(M)]$. It is equipped with the symplectic form, in full analogy with Eq. (2. 11) of the symplectic form of general relativity,

$$\Omega = \int d^4X [\delta\pi^{\mu\nu}(X) \wedge \delta g_{\mu\nu}(X) + \delta\pi(X) \wedge \delta\Phi(X). \quad (3. 1)$$

Next we restrict the configuration space to a submanifold consisting of metrics and scalar fields of the form

$$ds^2 = -A^2(X^0)(dX^0)^2 + e^{2a(X^0)}d\Omega_3^2 \quad (3.2)$$

$$\Phi(X) = \Phi(X^0), \quad (3.3)$$

where $d\Omega_3^2 = h_{ij}^\kappa dX^i dX^j$ and h_{ij}^κ is the homogeneous metric of constant curvature equal to $\kappa \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ on the surfaces $X^0 = \text{constant}$. The variable A^2 is the 00 component of the metric and e^a is the scale factor of the R-W universe.

Substituting into Eq. (3.1) we obtain the reduced symplectic form

$$\Omega = \int dX^0 [\delta\pi_A(X^0) \wedge \delta A(X^0) + \delta\pi_a(X^0) \wedge \delta a(X^0) + \delta\pi(X^0) \wedge \delta\Phi(X^0)], \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\pi_a(X^0) : = 2 \int d^3X \pi^{ij}(X) h_{ij}^\kappa(X^i) e^{2a(X^0)} \quad (3.5)$$

$$\pi_A(X^0) : = -2 \int d^3X \pi^{00}(X) A(X^0) \quad (3.6)$$

$$\pi_\phi(X^0) : = \int d^3X \pi_\phi(X). \quad (3.7)$$

The history state space Π_{RW} for the R-W model is the cotangent bundle of the space of paths in the variables A, a, ϕ , namely maps from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}^3$, such $X^0 \rightarrow [A(X^0), a(X^0), \phi(X^0)]$. The symplectic form Eq. (3.4) is non-degenerate on the state space Π_{RW} .

The spacetime diffeomorphisms are also projected on to the history space of the reduced model albeit they reduce to diffeomorphisms of the real line $\mathbb{R}$. They are generated by functions of the form

$$V_W = \int dX^0 [\pi_a \mathcal{L}_W a + \pi_A \mathcal{L}_W A + \pi_\phi \mathcal{L}_W \phi], \quad (3.8)$$

for any vector field $W = W(X^0) \frac{\partial}{\partial X^0}$.

The symplectic form Eq. (3.4) is written in a covariant or spacetime way. In order to write its canonical expression one needs to introduce a spacetime foliation.

In the case of histories general relativity, the introduction of metric-dependent foliations guaranteed the spacetime character of the canonical description, namely that the pull-back of the Lorentzian metric on the foliation three-surfaces is always a Riemannian metric[1, 2]. In the present context, however, the restriction into a homogeneous and isotropic spacetime has already taken care of this issue. While it is possible to introduce a metric-dependent foliation however there is no overriding physical reason demanding its introduction.

In the present model the definition of a foliation is equivalent to a choice of a time parameter t . In other words we introduce the function $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such

that $t \rightarrow X^0 = \mathcal{E}(t)$. $\mathcal{E}$ effects time-reparameterisations and for this reason it is a strictly increasing bijective function¹.

We may then define the canonical configuration variables

$$l_t := a(\mathcal{E}(t, a(\cdot), A(\cdot))) \quad (3.9)$$

$$N_t := A(\mathcal{E}(t, a(\cdot), A(\cdot))) \quad (3.10)$$

$$\phi_t := \Phi(\mathcal{E}(t, a(\cdot), A(\cdot))) \quad (3.11)$$

The symplectic form Eq. (3.4) then becomes

$$\Omega = \int dt [\delta\pi_{lt} \wedge \delta l_t + \delta\pi_{Nt} \wedge \delta N_t + \delta\pi_{\phi t} \wedge \delta\phi_t], \quad (3.12)$$

where we have introduced the variables

$$\pi_{lt} := \dot{\mathcal{E}}(t) \int dt' G_l(t, t') \pi_a(\mathcal{E}(t')) \quad (3.13)$$

$$\pi_{Nt} := \dot{\mathcal{E}}(t) \int dt' G_N(t, t') \pi_N(\mathcal{E}(t')) \quad (3.14)$$

$$\pi_{\phi t} := \dot{\mathcal{E}}(t) \int dt' G_\phi(t, t') \pi_\Phi(\mathcal{E}(t')), \quad (3.15)$$

and where $G_l(t, t')$, $G_N(t, t')$, $G_\phi(t, t')$ are complex kernels that depend on the functional derivatives $\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta a(t)}$ and $\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta N(t)}$ [1, 2]. In the case of non-metric-dependent foliations they reduce to delta functions. Note that the momentum variables are scalar densities of weight 1, with respect to time.

We should remark here that Eq. (3.12) can be alternatively obtained from the canonical histories symplectic form, by substituting a reduced expression for the metric, the lapse function and the shift vector. However we follow this approach in order to demonstrate the existence of a representation of the diffeomorphisms on the real line—see section 3.3.

3.2 Constraints

Next we follow the standard canonical analysis of minisuperspace models, hence we identify the constraints

$$C = \frac{1}{2}N \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{h}}(-\pi_t^2 + \pi_\phi^2) + \sqrt{h}(V(\phi) - \kappa e^l) \right) = 0 \quad (3.16)$$

$$\pi_N = 0, \quad (3.17)$$

that they form a first-class system. Here $V(\phi)$ is a potential for the scalar field ϕ and $h = e^{6l}$ is the determinant of the three-metric. It is important to remark that $\sqrt{h}$ is a scalar density of weight one with respect to *time*, since $\sqrt{-g} = N\sqrt{h}$ and $\sqrt{-g}$ is a spacetime density of weight one and N is a scalar

¹If we were to choose to a metric-dependent foliation $\mathcal{E}$, it should also be a functional of the components of the metric and it would read $\mathcal{E}(t, a(\cdot), A(\cdot))$.

function[1]. Even though $\sqrt{h}$ is numerically equal to e^{3l} it transforms differently under diffeomorphisms of the real line and for this reason we make this distinction in the expression for the constraint h^2 .

The histories version of the canonical constraints are

$$C(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \int dt \xi(t) N \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{h_t}} (-\pi_{lt}^2 + \pi_{\phi t}^2) + \sqrt{h_t} (V(\phi_t) - \kappa e^{l_t}) \right) = 0 \quad (3.18)$$

$$\pi_u = \int dt u(t) \pi_{Nt} = 0, \quad (3.19)$$

for all scalar smearing functions $\xi(t)$ and $u(t)$.

An alternative characterisation of the constraints involves the introduction of an arbitrary scalar density $w(t)$, of weight 1. We redefine the momenta

$$p_{lt} = \pi_{lt}/w(t), \quad (3.20)$$

$$p_{Nt} = \pi_{Nt}/w(t), \quad (3.21)$$

$$p_{\phi t} = \pi_{\phi t}/w(t), \quad (3.22)$$

and we rescale the metric determinant $\sqrt{h'} := \sqrt{h}/w(t)$, so that $p_{lt}, p_{Nt}, p_{\phi t}$, and $\sqrt{h'_t}$ are all scalar functions with respect to time. The Hamiltonian constraint is then written

$$C_\xi = \frac{1}{2} \int dt \xi(t) w(t) e^{-3\lambda_t} [-p_{lt}^2 + p_{\phi t}^2 + V(\phi_t) e^{6l_t} - \kappa e^{4l_t}]. \quad (3.23)$$

The price to pay then is that the symplectic form, (hence the Poisson brackets), involves explicitly the weight function $w(t)$

$$\Omega = \int dt w(t) [\delta p_{lt} \wedge \delta l_t + \delta p_{Nt} \wedge \delta N_t + \delta p_{\phi t} \wedge \delta \phi_t]. \quad (3.24)$$

The state space action functional for the model is written

$$S = V - H_N - \pi_N(u), \quad (3.25)$$

in terms of the Liouville function V , that generates time translations

$$V = \int dt (\pi_{lt} \dot{l}_t + \pi_{Nt} \dot{N}_t + \pi_{\phi t} \dot{\phi}_t). \quad (3.26)$$

The next step involves the implementation of the constraints and the construction of the reduced histories state space. The primary constraint $\pi_{Nt} = 0$ is trivially implemented. To implement the Hamiltonian constraint we first need to solve the constraint $H_t = 0$.

²This point is important because the histories constraints involve an integration over time and one has to keep an account of the densities for the definition to be independent of the choice of the t coordinate. This is not a feature of the histories formalism alone; it also appears in the construction of the phase space canonical action, which is an object that appears also in the standard formalism.

To simplify our analysis we shall assume that the scalar field potential $V(\phi)$ is a constant and it is equal to the cosmological constant $\Lambda > 0$. The constraint equation then reads $-p_{lt}^2 + p_{\phi t}^2 + U(l_t) = 0$, where $U(l_t) = e^{6l_t} - \kappa e^{4l_t}$ plays the role of a 'potential' for the variable l . There exist then two physically distinct cases.

3.2.1 $\Lambda > 0, \kappa \in \{0, -1\}$

In this case $U(l_t) > 0$ for all values of l_t and we may solve the constraint with respect to π_{lt}

$$\pi_{lt} = \pm \sqrt{\pi_{\phi t}^2 + U(l_t)}. \quad (3. 27)$$

The constraint surface consists of two disconnected components, one for each sign of π_l in the right-hand-side of equation Eq. (3. 27). The coordinate expression for the symplectic form Ω_C , restricted on the history constraint surface, is

$$\Omega_C = \int dt \left[\pm \frac{\pi_{\phi t}}{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi t}^2 + U(l_t)}} \delta\pi_{\phi t} \wedge \delta l_t + \delta\pi_{\phi t} \wedge \delta\phi_t \right]. \quad (3. 28)$$

For simplicity of the expressions we introduce the coordinate

$$f_{\pm t} := \phi_t \pm \pi_{\phi t} \int_0^{l_t} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi t}^2 + U(x)}}, \quad (3. 29)$$

and we then write the expression for the restricted symplectic form as

$$\Omega_C = \int dt \delta\pi_{\phi t} \wedge \delta f_{\pm t}. \quad (3. 30)$$

The vector fields $\frac{\delta}{\delta\pi_{\phi t}}$ and $\frac{\delta}{\delta f_{\pm t}}$ correspond to non-degenerate directions. The coordinates $\pi_{\phi t}$ and $f_{\pm t}$ commute with the constraints, hence they can be projected into functions $\tilde{\pi}\phi_t, \tilde{f}_{\pm t}$ on the histories reduced phase space. However the reduced phase space consists of two disconnected components, each of topology $\mathbf{R}^2$. We then write the symplectic form of the reduced state space as

$$\Omega_{red} = \int dt \delta\tilde{\pi}\phi_t \wedge \delta\tilde{f}_{\pm t}. \quad (3. 31)$$

In order to study the physical interpretation of each component we consider histories $(\pi_{\phi t}, f_{\pm t}) = (c_1, c_2)$, for constants c_1, c_2 that are solutions to the equations of motion as we shall see in what follows. These histories correspond to paths on the constraint surface that satisfy

$$\pi_{\phi t} = c_1 \quad (3. 32)$$

$$\dot{\phi}_t = c_2 \mp \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{c_1^2 + U(l)}} \dot{l}. \quad (3. 33)$$

In order to compare these solutions with known solutions of Einstein equations we choose a time variable that plays the role of a clock. This may be achieved by ‘fixing the gauge’ on the constraint surface [8, 9]; in this case the causal ordering parameter t assumes the role of a clock.

The most convenient gauge-fixing condition is to assume that $\dot{\phi} = \pi_{\phi} e^{-3l}$. The parameter t is then identified to be the global time of Robertson-Walker universes. It is easy to show that

$$\mp t = \int_{l_0}^l \frac{e^{3x} dx}{\sqrt{c_1^2 + U(x)}}, \quad (3.34)$$

which describes a contracting universe (with respect to t) in the plus sign branch, and an expanding universe in the minus sign branch. To check this result one may compute the integral for large l , in which case $e^l \sim e^{\mp \sqrt{\Lambda} t}$.

Finally, note that one may pass from the $+$ component of the reduced state space to the $-$ component, through the symplectic transformation $(\pi_{\phi t}, f_{\pm t}) \rightarrow (-\pi_{\phi t}, f_{\mp t})$.

3.2.2 $\Lambda > 0, \kappa = 1$

In this case the potential changes sign at $e^{2\lambda} = \frac{1}{\Lambda}$, so that $U(l) > 0$ for $l > l^c = \frac{1}{2} \log(1/\Lambda)$ and $U(l < 0)$ for $l < l^c$. The potential has a minimum $U_{min} = -\frac{4}{27\Lambda^2}$ at $e^{l_{min}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3\Lambda}}$.

We follow the same procedure as in the previous case, however in this case the constraint surface has a boundary, determined by the condition

$$\pi_{lt}^2 = \pi_{\phi t}^2 + U(l_t) \geq 0. \quad (3.35)$$

The boundary condition is trivially satisfied for $l > l^c$ but it places restrictions on the values of $\pi_{\phi t}$, for $l < l^c$.

The orbits generated by the constraints have different behavior in different regions of the constraint surface C_h ; this reflects into the non-trivial global structure of the reduced phase space.

- i. The regions U_+ and U_- correspond to the values of $\pi_{\phi t}^2 > |U_{min}|, \forall t$, and π_l being positive and negative respectively. As in the previous case U_- describes eternally expanding universes and U_+ collapsing ones. This is due to the fact that for $\pi_{\phi t}^2 > |U_{min}|$, the orbits of the constraints are curves with $l \in (-\infty, \infty)$. The quantities $\pi_{\phi t}$ and $f_{\pm t}$ are constant along the orbits and they project therefore to coordinates on the reduced histories state space. The symplectic form in this case is the same as Eq. (3.31).
- ii. For $\pi_{\phi t}^2 < |U_{min}|$ there exist again two disjoint regions. They both correspond to bouncing universes, because π_l can take both positive and negative values in the corresponding orbits. There exist two disjoint orbits for each value of π_{ϕ} there exist two disjoint orbits: one with $l \in (-\infty, l_1(\pi_{\phi})]$

and one with $l \in [l_2(\pi_\phi), \infty)$, where $l_1(\pi_\phi)$ and $l_2(\pi_\phi)$ the smaller and the larger real solutions of the equation $\pi_{\phi^2} + U(l) = 0$. The orbits of the first type (elements of $U_{<}$) correspond to an expanding universe that reaches the critical value $l_1(\pi_\phi)$ and re-collapses, while the orbits of the second type (elements of $U_{>}$) correspond to collapsing universes that reach $l_2(\pi_\phi)$ and then re-expands. Note, however, that for $\pi_\phi = 0$ there exists only one solution, which lies in $U_{>}$. The coordinates f_+ and f_- can be used in both U_+ and U_- , but are not independent. In $U_{<}$ we have

$$f_{t-} = f_{+t} + \pi_{\phi t} \int_{-\infty}^{l_1(\pi_{\phi t})} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi t}^2 + U(x)}}, \quad (3.36)$$

while in $U_{>}$,

$$f_{t-} = f_{+t} + \pi_{\phi t} \int_{l_2(\pi_{\phi t})}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi t}^2 + U(x)}}. \quad (3.37)$$

The symplectic form is locally the same as in equation Eq. (3.31).

- iii. There exist two bifurcate surfaces in Π_{red} , which forms the boundary between the regions $U_{\pm}$ and $U_{<}, U_{>}$. This boundary is characterised by values of $\pi_\phi = \pm\sqrt{|U_{min}|}$. For each sign of π_ϕ and value of $f_{\pm}$ there exist four different orbits in that surface. Two correspond to $l \in (-\infty, l^{cr})$, one expanding ($\pi_l < 0$) and one collapsing ($\pi_l > 0$). We will denote them $B_{<-}$ and $B_{<+}$ respectively. The other two correspond to $l \in (l^{cr}, \infty)$ (also collapsing and expanding)—we shall denote them as $B_{>-}$ and $B_{>+}$.
- iv. Finally there exist two degenerate orbits for $\pi_\phi = \pm\sqrt{|U_{min}|}, \pi_l = 0$ and for every value of $\phi = f_{\pm}$. These orbits only contain the point $l = l^{cr}$, and correspond to the static Einstein universe. In this case the symplectic form diverges; indeed the inclusion of those orbits in the reduced state space Π_{red} is incompatible with a smooth manifold structure, and renders Π_{red} into an orbifold. We shall denote the corresponding subset of the reduced state space as O .

3.3 Equations of motion and time-reparameterisation

It is easy to verify that the action functional S commutes weakly with the constraints, and thus projects to a function $\tilde{S}$ on the histories reduced state space Π_{red} . In fact $\tilde{S} = \tilde{V}$, where $\tilde{V}$ is the projection of V onto Π_{red} . The projected Liouville function $\tilde{V}$ still generates time translations on the reduced state space. Indeed,

$$\tilde{S} = \tilde{V} = \int dt \pi_{\phi t} \dot{f}_{\pm t}. \quad (3.38)$$

The existence of a symplectic representation of time-translations on Π_{red} highlights one of the most important properties of the histories formalism: time-ordering is not lost on the space of true degrees of freedom. Indeed, the parameter t that determines time ordering on Π is the same with the parameter t that determines time-ordering on Π_{red} .

The equations of motion Eq. (2. 8) on the reduced state space have the solutions $\pi_{\phi t} = \text{const.}$ and $f_{\pm t} = \text{const.}$

Since the classical paths correspond to constant values of their parameters, the solutions to the equations of motion are invariant under time reparameterisations. The issue arises, whether there exists a symplectic action of the group of time-reparameterisations that can be projected on the histories reduced state space.

To this end, the natural object to study is the family of functions V_U

$$V_U = \int dt(\pi_{lt}\mathcal{L}_U l_t + \pi_{Nt}\mathcal{L}_U N_t + \pi_{\phi t}\mathcal{L}_U \phi_t), \quad (3. 39)$$

where $U = U(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ is a vector field on $\mathbb{R}$. While these functions satisfy the algebra of the spacetime diffeomorphisms group $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{R})$, they do not commute weakly with the constraints, hence they cannot be projected on to the reduced state space. The reason is that they fail to reproduce the correct behaviour on $\sqrt{h_t}$, namely

$$\{V_U, \sqrt{h_t}\} = \mathcal{L}_U \sqrt{h_t}. \quad (3. 40)$$

While $\sqrt{h}$ is a scalar density of weight one, it transforms under V_U as a scalar function on $\mathbb{R}$, and consequently the constraints do not transform in a proper geometric way under the action of V_U . The only functions V_U that project into the reduced state space are those for which the condition $U(t) = \text{constant}$ holds; these functions are multiples of the Liouville generators of time translations.

Nonetheless a representation of time reparameterisations on the reduced state space does exist, but its generators are the functions V_W of equation Eq. (3. 8) rather than the ones of Eq. (3. 39). The functions (3. 8) generate a representation of $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{R})$ on Π_{RW} . If we assume that the foliation map $\mathcal{E}$ depends on the metric and satisfies the equivariance condition Eq. (2. 21), the functions V_W commute with the constraints and can therefore be projected on Π_{red} -see [2].

We must emphasise that the requirement of a metric-dependent foliation is only necessary in general relativity; it is superfluous in the minisuperspace model and it only appears in the discussion of the invariance of Π_{red} under diffeomorphisms. For this reason any parameterised system that does not possess an associated covariant diffeomorphic description is not expected to carry a symplectic action of the group $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{R})$ on the space of the true degrees of freedom Π_{red} .

4 Histories quantisation

In this section we provide a summary of the histories quantisation procedure, emphasising the methods for constructing the histories Hilbert space and the decoherence functional. We extend the discussion to the case of systems characterised by Hamiltonians without a vacuum state—this is the case relevant to the quantisation of minisuperspace models. We also elaborate on the physical distinction between different choices for the history Hilbert space.

4.1 The history group

The key object in histories quantisation is the histories Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$. In the case of discrete-time histories—namely for histories with support on the moments of time $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ —the history Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$ is the tensor product of the single-time Hilbert spaces $H_{t_1} \otimes H_{t_2} \otimes \dots \otimes H_{t_n}$, where H_{t_i} is a copy of the canonical Hilbert space of the theory, at time t_i . We recall that a history is represented by a projection operator on $\mathcal{V}$.

In the case of gravity we consider a continuous temporal support for the histories; the full real line $\mathbb{R}$ or perhaps an interval $[0, T] \in \mathbb{R}$. This suggests defining a continuous-tensor product of Hilbert spaces, which is a rather unwieldy object, being in general non-separable.

Isham and Linden [12] proposed a construction that addresses this issue. They constructed the continuous-time Hilbert space by seeking the representations of the *history group*, a history analogue of the canonical group. For a particle at a line[12]. the Lie algebra of the history group is

$$[\hat{x}_t, \hat{x}_{t'}] = 0 \quad (4.1)$$

$$[\hat{p}_t, \hat{p}_{t'}] = 0 \quad (4.2)$$

$$[\hat{x}_t, \hat{p}_{t'}] = i\delta(t, t'). \quad (4.3)$$

For an harmonic oscillator, one may select uniquely the Hilbert space if one assumes the existence of an operator representing the smeared Hamiltonian [13]. The result depends on important properties of quadratic Hamiltonians—it can be generalised to deal with systems that are described canonically by Fock spaces.

A crucial property of these constructions is that the Hilbert space that carry a representation of the history group can be casted in a tensor product-like form as $\mathcal{V} = \otimes_t H_t$. This is not a genuine tensor product but rather a specific mathematical object that can be rigorously defined. One may employ the tensor-product-like structure of the history Hilbert space to find more general representations of the history group [21]. We will employ such representations in the study of the minisuperspace models. The construction of the history Hilbert space relies heavily on the theory of coherent states, therefore we shall give a brief summary on the theory of coherent states for the study of Hilbert space representations— the reader is referred to references [22, 23] for details.

4.2 Coherent states

We assume a representation of the canonical or history group, by unitary operators $\hat{U}(g)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, let $\hat{h}$ denote the Hamiltonian of this system and by $|0\rangle_H$ the vacuum state, i.e. the Hamiltonian's lowest eigenstate. Then we define the coherent states as the vectors

$$|g\rangle := \hat{U}(g)|0\rangle. \quad (4.4)$$

Next we consider the equivalence relation on the canonical group defined as

$$g \sim g' \quad \text{if} \quad |g\rangle, |g'\rangle \quad \text{correspond to the same ray.}$$

The phase space Γ is identified as the quotient space $G/\sim$ and we label the (generalised) coherent states by points $z \in \Gamma$.

The fundamental property of coherent states is that they form an overcomplete basis, i.e., any vector $|\psi\rangle$ can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = \int d\mu(z) f(z) |z\rangle, \quad (4.5)$$

in terms of some complex-valued function f on Γ . Here $d\mu$ denotes some natural measure on Γ . There is also a decomposition of the unity in terms of the coherent states

$$\int d\mu(z) |z\rangle\langle z| = \hat{1}. \quad (4.6)$$

Another important property of coherent states is that the overlap kernel $\langle z'|z\rangle$ contains all the information about the Hilbert space and the group representation.

Let us denote an overlap kernel by $K(z|z')$. This may be a general function on $\Gamma \times \Gamma$. However, it has to satisfy two properties in order to correspond to coherent states. First, it has to be hermitian, $K(z|z') = K^*(z'|z)$. Second, it needs to be positive-definite, that is, for any sequence of complex numbers c_n and points $z_n \in \Gamma$,

$$\sum_{nm} c_n^* c_m K(z_n|z_m) \geq 0. \quad (4.7)$$

The last condition implies that $K(z, z) \geq 0$. We can now construct the corresponding Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ in the following way.

A vector on $\mathcal{H}$ can be constructed as a function on phase space Γ of the form $\Psi(z) = \sum_l c_l \langle z_l|z\rangle$, for a finite number of complex numbers c_l and state space points z_l . The inner product between two vectors characterised by c_l, z_l and c'_l, z'_l is

$$\sum_l c_l'^* c_l \langle z'_l|z_l\rangle. \quad (4.8)$$

The wave functions $\Psi_{z'}(z) = K(z'|z)$ form a family of coherent states on $\mathcal{H}$.

The canonical group is then represented by the operators $\hat{U}(g)$, which are defined by their action on coherent states

$$(\hat{U}(g)\Psi_{z'})(z) = e^{i\phi}\Psi_{gz'}(z), \quad (4.9)$$

where the precise choice of phase depends on the details of the group structure. The expression gz denotes the action of the group element g on the manifold Γ .

4.3 Constructing general representations of the history group

Let us denote the space of temporal supports by $\mathcal{T}$, which can be either $\mathbb{R}$ or and interval $[0, T] \in \mathbb{R}$. We construct the history Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$ by selecting a family L of normalised coherent states $|z\rangle$, on the Hilbert space of the canonical theory [21].

Next we define the space of all continuous paths from S to L . We write such paths $t \rightarrow |z\rangle_t$ as $|z(\cdot)\rangle$. We then construct the vector space V of *finite* linear combinations of the form $\sum_{i=1}^l |z_i(\cdot)\rangle$, which is equipped with the inner product

$$\langle z(\cdot) | z'(\cdot) \rangle = \exp \left(\int_S dt \log \langle z_t | z'_t \rangle \right). \quad (4.10)$$

In order to obtain finite values for this inner product we need to place some restrictions on the possible paths $z(\cdot)$, for the case $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}$. In particular we assume that $\langle z_t | z'_t \rangle$ converges rapidly to 1, for $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$; or else, all paths converge asymptotically to a fixed value of z_0 . When $\mathcal{T}$ is a bounded interval, there are no restrictions. We then employ $\langle z(\cdot) | z'(\cdot) \rangle$ as an overlap kernel for the coherent states $|z(\cdot)\rangle$. Then we use the definition of the overlap kernel for the construction of the history Hilbert space and the corresponding representation of the history group.

We define the Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$ by taking the closure of V with respect to the topology induced by the inner product Eq. (4.10). If the canonical coherent states are obtained by the action of a representation of the canonical group G , then the Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$ carries a representation of the corresponding history group.

For example, let us consider a generator $\hat{A}$ of the canonical group on $\mathcal{H}$. Then we may define the generator $\hat{A}_f = \int dt \hat{A}_t f(t)$ of the corresponding history group, which is smeared with respect to a function $f(t)$. To this end, we write the matrix elements of the corresponding one-parameter group of automorphisms as

$$\langle z(\cdot) | e^{i\hat{A}_f s} | z'(\cdot) \rangle = \exp \left(\int dt \log \langle z_t | e^{i\hat{A}f(t)s} | z'_t \rangle \right). \quad (4.11)$$

It is possible to show that $e^{i\hat{A}_f s}$ is continuous at $s = 0$ for a large class of functions f [21]. Hence, according to Stone's theorem, the operator $\mathcal{V}$ exists as a self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{V}$.

The role of coherent states is crucial in this construction. We could have chosen to construct a representation of the Hilbert space by introducing another arbitrary family L of vectors on the Hilbert space, and then repeat the same algorithm. However if the basis formed by this set of vectors was too small, then the resulting history space would not be able, in general, to carry many interesting self-adjoint history operators,—like the generators of the history group. On the other hand, if the set L was taken to be too large, (say the whole Hilbert space H), the resulting Hilbert space would again be too large and many interesting *unbounded* self-adjoint operators—such as the smeared Hamiltonian—could not have been defined. The choice of the set of vectors L to be a family of *coherent states* seems to be of exactly the right size.

However, different sets of coherent states may lead to different history Hilbert spaces and different representations of the history group. We must choose the set of coherent states, therefore, by taking into account the symmetries of the canonical theory, and in some cases—for example the presence of a Poincaré group symmetry and a Poincaré invariant vacuum—this choice might be rendered unique [15].

In the minisuperspace approximation, however, most traces of the original symmetry of general relativity have been lost. As a result the representation of the history group is non-unique.

4.4 Defining history operators

It is straightforward to define the analogue of the histories time-translation generator V on the history Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$. V is defined through the one-parameter group of unitary operators

$$e^{is\hat{V}}|z(\cdot)\rangle = |z'(\cdot)\rangle, \quad (4.12)$$

where $z'(t) = z(t + s)$. This definition is possible when the space of temporal supports $\mathcal{T}$ is equal to the whole real line.

The definition of the time-averaged Hamiltonian ‘restricts’ the arbitrariness in the choice of the history group representation, even to the extent of leading to a unique representation. Indeed, if the Hamiltonian $\hat{h}$ of the canonical theory possesses a unique vacuum state $|0\rangle$ such that $\hat{h}|0\rangle = 0$, we may define the coherent states by taking $|0\rangle$ as a reference vector. We may then define the one-parameter group of transformations $e^{i\hat{H}_\kappa s}$ by using the matrix elements

$$\langle z(\cdot) | e^{-i\hat{H}_\kappa s} | z'(\cdot) \rangle = \exp \left(\int_S dt \log \langle z_t | e^{-i\hat{h}_\kappa(t)s} | z'(t) \rangle \right). \quad (4.13)$$

We can easily prove that we can define a self adjoint operator if $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite interval. Alternatively, if $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{H}_\kappa$ can be defined if $|z_t\rangle$ converge asymptotically ($t \rightarrow \pm\infty$) to $|0\rangle$.

If the canonical vacuum is invariant under a symmetry of space translations then the definition of H_κ uniquely selects the representation of the history group [21].

In the case of the minisuperspace model the Hamiltonian operator does not have a continuous spectrum around zero. Hence we cannot define a vacuum state that could be used to select a preferred family of coherent states. The family of coherent states has to be chosen with reference to other symmetries of the theory.

In absence of a unique choice of coherent states we may still employ the Eq. (4. 13) for defining the smeared Hamiltonian H_κ . It is easy to show that

$$|\langle z(\cdot) | e^{-i\hat{H}_\kappa s} - 1 | z(\cdot) \rangle| < Cs \int_S dt \kappa(t) |\log \langle z_t | \hat{h} | z_t \rangle|, \quad (4. 14)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ for sufficiently small values of s .

If $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite interval, or if the smearing function $\kappa(t)$ has compact support then the integral Eq. (4. 14) takes a finite value. Hence the one-parameter group of transformations is continuous at $s = 0$, and according to Stone's theorem, the operator $\hat{H}_\kappa$ exists.

If $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}$ and if the time-averaging function $\kappa(t)$ does not vanish fast enough at infinity, then the integral Eq. (4. 14) diverges, since the quantity $\langle z_t | \hat{h} | z_t \rangle$ tends to the non-zero value $\langle 0 | \hat{h} | 0 \rangle$ at infinity. Hence we cannot prove the existence of the $\hat{H}_\kappa$ operator, while if $\hat{h}$ possessed $|0\rangle$ as an eigenstate $\hat{H}_\kappa$ would be definable for any measurable function $\kappa(t)$ ³.

Once we have defined the self-adjoint operators $\hat{V}$ and $\hat{H}_\kappa$ we can easily show that they satisfy the commutation relations

$$[\hat{V}, \hat{H}_\kappa] = i\hat{H}_\kappa. \quad (4. 15)$$

4.5 The decoherence functional

In the histories formalism the probabilities are contained in the decoherence functional. The decoherence functional incorporates the information about the initial state, the dynamics and the instantaneous laws. We expect therefore to implement the constraints in the construction of the decoherence functional.

The decoherence functional is a complex-valued function of a pair of histories. A history may be represented by a projection operator P on $\mathcal{V}$, so the decoherence functional is a function of a pair of projection operators. A projector may be written in terms of fine-grained, one-dimensional projectors of the form $|f\rangle\langle f|$, by means of coarse-graining operations. Furthermore, any vector $|f\rangle \in \mathcal{V}$ may be written as a linear combination of coherent states. For this reason, it is sufficient to compute the decoherence functional for a pair of projectors onto coherent states.

There exists a rather general theorem about the form of the decoherence functional in a physical system [24]. If the decoherence functional satisfies a

³We can always redefine $\hat{h}$ up to an additive constant so that $\langle 0 | \hat{h} | 0 \rangle = 0$, but this does not remove the ambiguity in the choice of a family of coherent states. Such a redefinition is also inadequate for the case that $\hat{h}$ represents a constraint, because the addition of a constant to a constraint produces a constraint with a different physical content.

version of the Markov property—namely that expectations of physical observables at a moment of time allow the determination of expectations at all future moments of time—then it can be obtained as a suitable continuous limit of the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}
d(z_1, t_1; z_2, t_2; \dots; z_n, t_n | z'_1, t'_1; z'_2, t'_2; \dots; z'_m, t'_m) = \\
\langle z'_m | e^{-i\hat{H}(t'_m - t_n)} | z_n \rangle \langle z_n | e^{-i\hat{H}(t_n - t_{n-1})} | z_{n-1} \rangle \dots \\
\times \langle z_2 | e^{-i\hat{H}(t_2 - t_1)} | z_1 \rangle \langle z_1 | e^{-i\hat{H}(t_1 - t_0)} | z_0 \rangle \langle z_0 | \hat{\rho}_0 | z'_0 \rangle \\
\times \langle z'_0 | e^{i\hat{H}(t'_1 - t_0)} | z'_1 \rangle \langle z'_1 | e^{i\hat{H}(t'_2 - t'_1)} | z'_2 \rangle \dots \langle z'_{n-1} | e^{i\hat{H}(t'_n - t'_{n-1})} | z'_n \rangle.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

The decoherence functional takes value in an n -point and an m -point history, while $\hat{\rho}_0$ is the initial state.

In the continuous-time limit ($|t_i - t_{i-1}| < \delta t$, for all i and $\delta t \rightarrow 0$) the decoherence functional becomes

$$d[z(\cdot), z'(\cdot)] \sim e^{iS[z(\cdot)] - iS[z'(\cdot)]}, \quad (4.17)$$

where $S = V - \int dt h(z)$ is the classical action functional and $h(z, z) = \langle z | \hat{h} | z \rangle$.

For differentiable paths $z(\cdot)$ the choice of the family of coherent states (and hence the representation of the history group) does not affect the values of the decoherence functional. The difference between representations appears for non-differentiable paths. In this case, one has to keep terms of order δt^2 ; then it can be shown that different representations provide different contributions[26].

The last result is particularly relevant in the study of coarse-grained histories. In order to construct a coarse-grained history we have to sum over coherent state paths. This involves employing an integration measure which, by necessity, has support on non-differentiable paths (cylinder sets), and provides different results for different families of coherent states.

In conclusion, different choices of coherent states families, implies different representations for the history group. All representations—with the same Hamiltonian—provide the same values for the decoherence functional for fine-grained, differentiable coherent state histories. However they involve different rules for coarse-graining and hence provide different answers to probabilities for coarse-grained histories. It is very important that physical criteria should exist, that allow the unique selection of a representation for the history group.

5 The implementation of constraints

In order to study the quantisation of parameterised systems such as the minisuperspace model, one has to extend the previous analysis to deal with systems that possess first class constraints. In section 4.5 we noted that if the quantum history theory description of a system is assumed to satisfy a version of the Markov property, then the quantum description of the system is obtained from the knowledge of the coherent states of the standard theory. The ambiguity in

the choice of a family of coherent states can be in principle resolved—as it does in a large class of systems that have been studied[15, 21, 25]—by the knowledge of the symmetries of the fully covariant theory.

In the case of gravity this would imply that we possess the knowledge of the full quantum gravity theory—at least at the kinematical level. In particular, it would mean that we have explicitly constructed coherent states for the history variables of general relativity $|g_{\mu\nu}(\cdot), \pi^{\mu\nu}(\cdot)\rangle$, in such a way as to implement the principle of general covariance—the existence of a unitary representation of the $Diff(M)$ group whose generators commutes with the history version of the canonical constraints—as we have in classical history theory. We would then restrict the definition of these coherent states for the special case of a R-W metric.

In absence of a theory for the full spacetime symmetries of general relativity, the quantisation of minisuperspace models is beset with a degree of arbitrariness, which is related to the choice of a proper integration measure of coarse-grainings. Next we analyse this issue in detail.

There exist two main general schemes for the quantisation of constrained systems that do not involve gauge fixing: Dirac quantisation and reduced state space quantisation. The former implements the constraints at the quantum mechanical level, while the latter implements them classically and then attempts to quantise the classical reduced state space. We study both schemes in the following two subsections.

5.1 Dirac quantisation

In [16] we analysed the transcription of the Dirac quantisation method in the history context. The general idea is to first construct the Hilbert space of the unconstrained system, and then to identify an operator that represents the canonical constraint smeared in time; the zero-eigenspace of the constraint operator is the physical Hilbert space.

Specifically, if $\mathcal{H}$ is the single time Hilbert space of the standard canonical theory, equipped with a set of coherent states $|z(\cdot)\rangle$, and if $\mathbf{E}$ is the projector into the zero eigenspace of the constraint, then, the matrix elements of $\mathbf{E}$ of the coherent states $\langle z|\mathbf{E}|z'\rangle$ define a new overlap kernel; from this kernel one may define the physical Hilbert space [27, 28].

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$ of the corresponding history theory is then spanned by coherent state paths $|z(\cdot)\rangle$, which may be employed to define the projector $\mathbf{E}_{his}$ to the history physical Hilbert space

$$\langle z(\cdot)|\mathbf{E}_{his}|z'(\cdot)\rangle = \exp\left(\int_S dt \log\langle z_t|\mathbf{E}_t|z'_t\rangle\right). \quad (5.1)$$

Then we define the decoherence functional for coherent state paths as

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_1, t_1; z_2, t_2; \dots; z_n, t_n | z'_1, t'_1; z'_2, t'_2; \dots; z'_m, t'_m) = \\ \langle z'_m|\mathbf{E}|z_n\rangle \langle z_n|\mathbf{E}|z_{n-1}\rangle \dots \langle z_2|\mathbf{E}|z_1\rangle \langle z_1|\mathbf{E}|z_0\rangle \langle z_0|\mathbf{E}\hat{\rho}_0\mathbf{E}|z'_0\rangle \\ \langle z'_0|\mathbf{E}|z'_1\rangle \langle z'_1|\mathbf{E}|z'_2\rangle \dots \langle z'_{n-1}|\mathbf{E}|z'_n\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Writing formally $\mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\xi e^{i\xi\hat{h}}$ and inserting this expression at every time step we may write the decoherence functional in the continuous limit as

$$d[z(\cdot), z'(\cdot)] = \langle z_0 | \hat{\rho}_0 | z_0 \rangle \int D\xi(\cdot) D\xi'(\cdot) e^{i(V-H_\xi)[z(\cdot)] - i(V-H_{\xi'})[z'(\cdot)]}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $D\xi(\cdot)$ is the continuous limit of $\frac{d\xi_{t_1} d\xi_{t_2} \dots d\xi_{t_n}}{(2\pi)^n}$. This expression is equivalent to the decoherence functional of a system with smeared Hamiltonian H_ξ , integrating however over all possible paths of the Lagrange multiplier ξ .

A weak point of the Dirac quantisation is that, typically the canonical constraint possesses continuous spectrum near zero. Hence, the physical Hilbert space is not a subspace of the initial Hilbert space. To deal with such problems one has to employ more elaborate techniques, usually involving the concept of the induced inner product,—see [29] for a discussion close to our present context.

The kernel $K(z, z')$ has degenerate directions, namely there exist points z_1 and z_2 , such that $|K(z_1, z_2)|^2 = 1$. This implies that we have to quotient the parameters of the state space with respect to the equivalence relation

$$z \sim z' \quad \text{if} \quad |K(z, z')|^2 = 1.$$

For a large class of constraints this results to an overlap kernel defined over the reduced state space[27]; this property is not in general guaranteed.

In any case, we obtain a family of coherent state paths $|\zeta(\cdot)\rangle$ on V_{phys} , and a map from V to V_{phys} implemented through the coherent states as $|z(\cdot)\rangle \rightarrow |\zeta(\cdot)\rangle$, where ζ corresponds to the equivalence class in which z belongs.

We exploited the Dirac method, in [16], for the simple example of the relativistic particle. However, we have found a more convenient quantisation method, that entails ideas from both the reduced state space and the Dirac quantisation and it seems to be more suitably adapted to the needs of the histories scheme.

5.2 Reduced state space quantisation

The key idea of the reduced state space quantisation is to implement the constraints *before* quantisation, at the level of the classical state space, and then to seek an appropriate quantum representation for the reduced state space.

It is easier, in general, to solve the constraints in classical theory than in the quantum theory—we have for example no problems with the continuous spectrum of operators or issues related to normal ordering. Nevertheless, the reduced state space is usually a manifold of non-trivial topological structure (not a cotangent bundle); often it is not even a manifold, if it possesses orbitfold-like singularities.

The reduced state space quantisation scheme has also other drawbacks. For example, the reduced state space of field systems generically consists of non-local variables: the true degrees of freedom are not fields themselves. For this reason the spacetime character of the theory is not explicitly manifest in the reduced

state space. We have then no way to represent fields quantum mechanically and to study their corresponding symmetries.

Histories general relativity is an exception to this rule though, because the spacetime diffeomorphisms group is represented both on the unconstrained and on the reduced state space[2].

Since histories quantisation—in the form we presented here—relies strongly on the coherent states, it may be possible to exploit the fact that they provide a link between the classical state space description and the quantum mechanical one on a Hilbert space. Then we may implement the constraints at the classical level, while preserving the basic structures of Dirac quantisation, namely the coexistence of a Hilbert space—corresponding to the full classical phase space—with the Hilbert space of the true degrees of freedom.

The resulting construction is a hybrid between the reduced state space quantisation and Dirac quantisation. It will be presented in full details elsewhere[30]. Here we shall explain the method with reference to the histories construction.

For the construction of a histories Hilbert space, of the true degrees of freedom, it is sufficient to identify a set of coherent states on the reduced state space of the single-time theory. This point was fully explained in the previous section.

Let us denote as $|\zeta\rangle$ these coherent states, $\zeta \in \Gamma_{red}$. All information about the quantum theory is contained in the overlap kernel $K_{red}(\zeta, \zeta')$ which is a function on $\Gamma_{red} \times \Gamma_{red}$.

In Dirac quantisation we start with the full Hilbert space, which contains a family of coherent states $|z\rangle$. The associated overlap kernel $K(z, z')$ is a function on $\Gamma \times \Gamma$, where Γ is the state space of the system before the imposition of the constraints. The overlap kernel contains all information about the Hilbert space of the system and of the physical observables. The important issue is, then, to find a procedure in order to pass from a function on $\Gamma \times \Gamma$ to a function of $\Gamma_{red} \times \Gamma_{red}$, in accord with the geometric definition of the reduced state space.

We shall employ here a specific procedure that is based upon the geometric structure induced by the coherent states on the classical state space. Of relevance is the limiting behaviour of the overlap kernel $\langle z|z'\rangle$ when $z' = z + \delta z$,

$$\langle z|z + \delta z\rangle = \exp\left(iA_i(z + \frac{\delta z}{2})\delta z^i - \frac{1}{2}g_{ij}\delta z^i\delta z^j\right) + O(\delta z^3), \quad (5.4)$$

and where A_i is a U(1)-connection one-form and g_{ij} is a Riemannian metric on the classical state space

$$iA_i(z) = \langle z|\partial_i z\rangle, \quad (5.5)$$

$$g_{ij}(z) = \langle \partial_i z|\partial_j z\rangle + A_i(z)A_j(z). \quad (5.6)$$

The important point here is that this short-distance behavior allows one to fully reconstruct the overlap kernel as a path-integral [31, 32]

$$\langle z|z'\rangle = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}_\nu(t) \int Dz(\cdot) e^{i \int A - \frac{1}{2\nu} \int_0^t ds g_{ij} \dot{z}^i \dot{z}^j}, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\nu(t)$ is a factor entering for the purpose of correct normalisation. In other words, the metric on phase space defines a Wiener process on phase space, which may be employed to regularise the usual expression for the coherent-state-path-integral. An overlap kernel then needs two inputs for its construction: the connection one-form on state space and the Riemannian metric.

In the context of the reduced quantisation procedure, the one-form A may be easily defined on the reduced state space, because it is a symplectic potential of the corresponding symplectic form.

The key point is to identify a metric $\tilde{g}$ on the reduced state space, starting from a metric γ on the unconstrained state space Γ . The key observation is that an element of the reduced state space—being an orbit of the constraint's action—is a submanifold of Γ . Two such submanifolds do not intersect, because different equivalence classes are always disjoint. One may then define a distance function between any two such submanifolds

$$D_{red}(\zeta, \zeta') = \inf_{z \in \zeta, z' \in \zeta'} D(z, z'), \quad (5. 8)$$

where $\zeta, \zeta' \in \Gamma_{red}$ and D is the distance function on Γ corresponding to the metric ds^2 on Γ . The distance function D_{red} on Γ_{red} defines a metric on Γ_{red} that may be employed in the construction of the corresponding overlap kernel via the path-integral Eq. (5. 7).

5.3 The R-W minisuperspace model

Next we shall apply the scheme sketched above[30] to the R-W minisuperspace model.

We first select the family of coherent states on the single-time Hilbert space H . We have previously explained that this choice should reflect the symmetries of the underlying theory. To the extent that the spacetime diffeomorphism symmetry of gravity has been lost in the reduction to the homogeneous and isotropic model we consider here, the choice is more or less arbitrary. We find convenient to employ the standard Gaussian coherent states, parameterised by $l, \pi_l, \phi, \pi_\phi, N, \pi_N$ with an overlap kernel

$$\begin{aligned} \langle l, \pi_l, \phi, \pi_\phi, N, \pi_N | l', \pi_l', \phi', \pi_\phi', N', \pi_N' \rangle = \\ \exp \left(i\pi_\phi \phi' - i\pi_\phi' \phi + i\pi_l l' - i\pi_l' l + i\pi_N N' - i\pi_N' N \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2} [(l-l')^2 + (\pi_l - \pi_l')^2 + (\phi - \phi')^2 - (\pi_\phi - \pi_\phi')^2] - (N - N')^2 - (\pi_N - \pi_N')^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5. 9)$$

The corresponding state space metric is

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{2} (dl^2 + d\pi_l^2 + d\phi^2 + d\pi_\phi^2 + dN^2 + d\pi_N^2). \quad (5. 10)$$

The elements of the reduced state space correspond to surfaces of fixed $\pi_\phi, f_\pm$, while $\pi_l = \pm \sqrt{\pi_\phi^2 + U(l)}$. Each point of such a surface is characterised by the

values of the parameters l and N . The N dependence is trivial and we shall disregard it. Hence the distance between two surfaces characterised by $f_{\pm}, \pi_{\phi}$ and $f'_{\pm}, \pi'_{\phi}$ respectively, is

$$D(f_{\pm}, \pi_{\phi}; f'_{\pm}, \pi'_{\phi}) = \inf_{l, l'} \frac{1}{2} [(l-l')^2 + (\sqrt{\pi_{\phi}^2 + U(l)} - \sqrt{\pi_{\phi}'^2 + U(l')})^2] \quad (5. 11)$$

$$+ (f_{\pm} - f'_{\pm} \mp \pi_{\phi} \int_{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi}^2 + U(x)}}^l \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi}^2 + U(x)}} \pm \pi'_{\phi} \int_{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi}'^2 + U(x)}}^{l'} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\pi_{\phi}'^2 + U(x)}})^2 - (\pi_{\phi} - \pi'_{\phi})^2].$$

To obtain the metric $d\tilde{s}^2$ on Γ_{red} , we need to take the infimum in the above expression for neighbouring orbits, namely the ones for which $f'_{\pm} = f_{\pm} + \delta f_{\pm}$ and $\pi'_{\phi} = \pi_{\phi} + \delta \pi_{\phi}$.

First we consider the case that the parameter l takes value in the full real axis in every orbit. This is the case for $\kappa = 0, -1$, but also for $\kappa = +1$ in the regions U_+ and U_- of the reduced state space.

In this case we observe that, neighbouring orbits converge as $l \rightarrow \infty$, while they diverge exponentially at $l \rightarrow -\infty$. It is easy to show that the infimum is achieved for $l' \rightarrow l$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. This leads to the metric

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = \frac{1}{2} (d\tilde{\pi}_{\phi}^2 + d\tilde{f}_{\pm}^2). \quad (5. 12)$$

For the $U_<$ and $U_>$ regions of the reduced state space in the case $\kappa = +1$, we should recall that the parameter λ takes values in $(-\infty, l_1]$ and $[l_2, \infty)$ respectively. The corresponding orbits tend to converge near l_1 and l_2 and the local minimum value for the distance of the orbits corresponding to $(\pi_{\phi}, f_{\pm})$ and $(\pi_{\phi} + \delta \pi_{\phi}, f_{\pm} + \delta f_{\pm})$ equals

$$\frac{1}{2} [\delta f_{\pm}^2 + (1 + \frac{4\pi_{\phi}^2}{|U'(l_{1,2})|^2}) \delta \pi_{\phi}^2]. \quad (5. 13)$$

In the $U_<$ branch this value is a global minimum, because at $l \rightarrow \infty$ the orbits diverge. In the $U_>$ branch, however, the global minimum is achieved at $l \rightarrow \infty$, and corresponds to the metric of equation Eq. (5. 12). Hence we conclude that the metric in the reduced state space has the value

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = \frac{1}{2} [d\tilde{f}_{\pm}^2 + (1 + \frac{4\tilde{\pi}_{\phi}^2}{|U'(l_1(\tilde{\pi}_{\phi}))|^2}) d\tilde{\pi}_{\phi}^2], \quad (5. 14)$$

in the region $U_<$ (for re-collapsing universes), and the value Eq. (5. 12) in the region $U_>$.

There is clearly a discontinuity at the boundary region $\pi_{\phi}^2 = |U_{min}|$, where the metric Eq. (5. 14) diverges. This divergence is, however, an artifact of the coordinates employed. The study of geodesics near the boundary demonstrates that the distance function remains finite.

Recall that at the boundary $\pi_{\phi}^2 = |U_{min}|$, there exist five different orbits for each value of $f - \pm$ and sign of π_{ϕ} . It is easy to verify that in the quantum

theory the distance function between those five orbits vanishes. Hence, all five orbits are described by one single coherent state in the quantum theory. It follows that the divergent points of the classical reduced state space disappear in the quantum theory. This is an interesting result, because it suggests that the orbifold-like structure of the reduced state space may be generically 'smeared', when one passes to quantum theory.

Having identified the metric on the reduced state space, we employ the path integral Eq. (5. 7) to construct the overlap kernel on the reduced state space. For the cases $\kappa = 0, -1$ and for the regions $U_+, U_-, U_>$ of case $\kappa = 1$, this yields the familiar Gaussian coherent states

$$\langle \tilde{\pi}_\phi, \tilde{f}_\pm | \tilde{\pi}_\phi, \tilde{f}_\pm \rangle = \exp \left(i\tilde{\pi}_\phi \tilde{f}'_\pm - i\tilde{\pi}'_\phi \tilde{f}_\pm - \frac{1}{2}[(\tilde{\pi}_\phi - \tilde{\pi}'_\phi)^2 + (\tilde{f}_\pm - \tilde{f}'_\pm)^2] \right). \quad (5. 15)$$

For $\kappa = 1$ and an overlap kernel in which one of the entries lies in $U_<$, we have to employ the metric Eq. (5. 14), from which it is very difficult to obtain an analytic solution.

We should make a last comment, here, on the relation of this procedure to the Dirac quantisation. The crucial difference in the present method is that it does not quantise the constraints, but it implements them at the classical level. Both algorithms are expected to provide the same results in the semiclassical level. However the reduced state space quantisation is not a semiclassical approximation to the Dirac quantisation. It is a quantisation method in its own right.

Whether the constraints are to be implemented at the quantum or the classical level remains an open issue, that cannot be settled *a priori*: both approaches yield a quantisation method that provide the same classical limit. The choice between these attitudes to canonical quantisation can only be determined by their eventual success.

6 Histories quantum R-W model

6.1 Representations of the Hilbert space

The prescription for the implementation of the constraints described in the previous section translates immediately to the history context. The first step is to construct the Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$, which carries a representation of the history group with Lie algebra

$$[l_t, \pi_{lt'}] = i\delta(t, t') \quad (6. 1)$$

$$[\phi_t, \pi_{\phi t'}] = i\delta(t, t') \quad (6. 2)$$

$$[N_t, \pi_{Nt}] = i\delta(t, t') \quad (6. 3)$$

The representation of the algebra Eqs. (6. 2-6. 3) is selected by the choice of a canonical coherent states family, by means of the inner product Eq. (4. 10).

From the Gaussian coherent states Eq. (5. 10) we obtain

$$\langle l(\cdot), \pi_l(\cdot), \phi(\cdot), \pi_\phi(\cdot), N(\cdot), \pi_N(\cdot) | l'(\cdot), \pi_l'(\cdot), \phi'(\cdot), \pi_\phi'(\cdot), N'(\cdot), \pi_N'(\cdot) \rangle = \exp \left(\int dt [i\pi_{\phi t} \phi_t' - i\pi_{\phi t}' \phi_t + i\pi_{lt} l_t' - i\pi_{lt}' l_t + i\pi_{Nt} N_t' - i\pi_{Nt}' N_t] \right) \quad (6. 4)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} [(l_t - l_t')^2 + \frac{1}{w(t)} (\pi_{lt} - \pi_{lt}')^2 + (\phi_t - \phi_t')^2 - \frac{1}{w(t)} (\pi_{\phi t} - \pi_{\phi t}')^2] - (N_t - N_t')^2 - \frac{1}{w(t)} (\pi_{Nt} - \pi_{Nt}')^2 \Big). \quad (6. 5)$$

The function $w(t)$ is a density of weight 1 and it is introduced so that the definition of the integral is properly invariant with respect to diffeomorphisms—see the discussion in section 3.2. Different choices of w lead to different representations of the history group. The choice of w , however, does not affect the probability assignment through the decoherence functional and we shall, henceforward, set it to be equal to one.

Equation Eq. (6. 5) allows one to identify $\mathcal{V}$ with the Fock space $e^{\mathcal{N}}$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}, C^3, dt)$. The history operators are defined by means of the one parameter group of unitary transformations they generate. For example, writing the smeared operator $\hat{l}(f) = \int dt \hat{l}_t f(t)$, we define

$$e^{is\hat{l}(f)} |l(\cdot), \pi_l(\cdot), \phi(\cdot), \pi_\phi(\cdot), N(\cdot), \pi_N(\cdot)\rangle := |l(\cdot) + sf(\cdot), \phi(\cdot), \pi_\phi(\cdot), N(\cdot), \pi_N(\cdot)\rangle \quad (6. 6)$$

Next we construct the Hilbert space of the true degrees of freedom $\mathcal{V}_{phys}$. It is spanned by coherent state paths $|\tilde{\pi}_\phi(\cdot), \tilde{f}_\pm(\cdot)\rangle$, that are constructed from the reduced coherent states $|\tilde{\pi}_\phi, \tilde{f}_\pm\rangle$ of the standard canonical theory.

Note that in the case $\kappa = 0, -1$ the reduced overlap kernel is Gaussian

$$\langle \tilde{\pi}_\phi(\cdot), \tilde{f}_\pm(\cdot) | \tilde{\pi}_\phi(\cdot), \tilde{f}_\pm(\cdot) \rangle = \exp \left(\int dt [i\tilde{\pi}_{\phi t} \tilde{f}_{\pm t}' - i\tilde{\pi}_{\phi t}' \tilde{f}_{\pm t} - \frac{1}{2} [(\tilde{\pi}_{\phi t} - \tilde{\pi}_{\phi t}')^2 + (\tilde{f}_{\pm t} - \tilde{f}_{\pm t}')^2]] \right). \quad (6. 7)$$

The corresponding Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}_{phys}$ is a direct sum of two copies of the Fock space $e^{\mathcal{N}_{phys}}$, where $\mathcal{N}_{phys}$ is the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}, C, dt)$. The one copy corresponds to the expanding and the other to the collapsing universe solutions.

6.2 The decoherence functional

We may also construct the decoherence functional on $\mathcal{V}_{phys}$, which reads at the discrete level

$$d(\zeta_1, t_1; \zeta_2, t_2; \dots; \zeta_n, t_n | \zeta_1', t_1'; \zeta_2', t_2'; \dots; \zeta_m', t_m') = \langle \zeta_m' | \zeta_n \rangle \langle \zeta_n | \zeta_{n-1} \rangle \dots \langle \zeta_2 | \zeta_1 \rangle \langle \zeta_1 | \zeta_0 \rangle \langle \zeta_0 | \hat{\rho}_0 | \zeta_0' \rangle \times \langle \zeta_0' | \zeta_1' \rangle \langle \zeta_1' | \zeta_2' \rangle \dots \langle \zeta_{m-1}' | \zeta_m' \rangle. \quad (6. 8)$$

At the continuous-time limit

$$d[\zeta(\cdot), \zeta'(\cdot)] \sim e^{i\tilde{V}[\zeta(\cdot)] - i\tilde{V}[\zeta'(\cdot)]}, \quad (6. 9)$$

where $\tilde{V}$ is the classical Liouville function on the reduced state space.

It is important to remark that the reduced state space quantisation allows one to construct the decoherence functional already at the level of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$. The coherent states construction induces a map may(?) employ the projection map π from the history constraint surface to the reduced state space, in order to construct a map between the associated coherent states

$$i : |z(\cdot)\rangle \in \mathcal{V} \rightarrow |\zeta(\cdot)\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{his}, \quad (6.10)$$

provided that z is a path on the constraint surface. One may then employ this map to *pull-back* the decoherence functional on $\mathcal{V}$. Clearly the pull-backed decoherence functional has support only on coherent state paths on the constraint surface.

We compare the above result for the decoherence functional, with the one that results when applying the Dirac quantisation scheme. To this end, we write a decoherence functional on $\mathcal{V}$ with a delta function imposing the restriction of coherent state paths on the constraint surface

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_1, t_1; z_2, t_2; \dots; z_n, t_n | z'_1, t'_1; z'_2, t'_2; \dots; z'_m, t'_m) = \\ \langle z'_m | z_n \rangle \langle z_n | z_{n-1} \rangle \dots \langle z_2 | z_1 \rangle \langle z_1 | z_0 \rangle \langle z_0 | \hat{\rho}_0 | z'_0 \rangle \\ \times \langle z'_0 | z'_1 \rangle \langle z'_1 | z'_2 \rangle \dots \langle z'_{n-1} | z'_n \rangle \prod_{ij} \delta(C_{t_i}) \delta(C_{t'_j}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

where $\delta(C_t)$ is the delta-function restricting paths on the constraint surface.

Since the delta-function may be written as

$$\delta(C) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\xi e^{iC\xi}, \quad (6.12)$$

then, at the continuous limit we obtain the following expression, for the decoherence functional

$$d[z(\cdot), z'(\cdot)] = \langle z_0 | \hat{\rho}_0 | z_0 \rangle \int D\xi(\cdot) D\xi'(\cdot) e^{i(V-H_\xi)[z(\cdot)] - i(V-H_{\xi'})[z'(\cdot)]}, \quad (6.13)$$

where $D\xi(\cdot)$ is the continuous limit of $\frac{d\xi_{t_1} d\xi_{t_2} \dots d\xi_{t_n}}{(2\pi)^n}$, $H_\xi = \int dt \xi(t) C_t$. Equation (6.13) which is a formal expression analogous to equation Eq. (5.3) obtained from Dirac quantisation.

6.3 Initial conditions and the classical limit

If the space of temporal supports $\mathcal{T}$ is real line, then we need to restrict our considerations to coherent state paths $\zeta(\cdot)$, that converge asymptotically to a fixed value $\bar{\zeta}$, otherwise the inner product will be bounded.

For each value of $\bar{\zeta}$ we construct a different Hilbert space and a different histories theory. We usually choose $\bar{\zeta}$ by the requirement that $|\bar{\zeta}\rangle$ is the minimum energy state. However, in the physical Hilbert space of parameterised

systems the Hamiltonian operator vanishes, therefore we have no criterion for the selection of the vacuum state. A different choice of the initial condition will yield a different representation for the histories theory. Therefore, different initial conditions define different theories, a fact that seems singularly attractive at the cosmological context, which is the only domain of physics in which the limit $t \rightarrow -\infty$ may be taken literally⁴.

It is easy to study the classical limit of the model, since the Hamiltonian vanishes on the reduced state space. Omnés has showed in [4, 33] that, for coarse-grained histories that correspond to smearing within a phase space region of typical size L , much larger than one ($\hbar = 1$), the off-diagonal elements of the decoherence functional fall rapidly to zero. The evolution peaks around the classical path with probability very close to one⁵.

When we apply the above result in the context of the minisuperspace model problem, we notice that histories peaked around the initial condition $|\bar{\zeta}\rangle$ have probabilities very close to zero, hence, the system will be adequately described by the corresponding classical solution.

It is rather interesting to provide an order of magnitude estimation for processes that do not contribute to a classical path, for example, processes that correspond to the various proposals about the initial condition of the universe.

In the case of the minisuperspace model with $\kappa = +1$ we consider, for example, an initial state within the region $U_<$ (corresponding to a universe with a bounded radius), and we examine the probability of the realised history that corresponds to an expanding universe.

We consider an initial state within $U_<$ with $\pi_\phi^2 = \epsilon \ll 1$. This corresponds to a universe of radius e^l , close to zero. Since the point $e^l = 0$ is excluded from the gravitational phase space (the metric is degenerate there) this is the closer we can get to an initial condition analogous to that of the tunnelling proposal for the wave function of the universe. For simplicity, we shall assume that the initial state is characterised by the value of $f_- = 0$ —within the present model this assumption does not affect the final results.

We may then ask about the probability that the universe will be found sometime in the future within the region $U_<$, with $\pi_\phi \simeq 0$, a state that corresponds to the onset of inflation and evolve from there according to the classical equations of motion.

We construct coarse-grained histories, in which the reduced state space is partitioned in cells, which are centered around specific values for $\pi_\phi, f_\pm$, with typical length $L \gg 1$. The off-diagonal elements of the decoherence functional between such histories will be very small (according to Omnés theorem) and the probability that the universe will be found in a cell C centered around a specific

⁴We remind the reader that the cosmological singularity lies outside the spacetime, so the topology of the space of temporal supports in cosmology is $(0, \infty)$ which is homeomorphic to the real line $\mathbb{R}$

⁵This is valid for a large class of Hamiltonians including the trivial case of zero Hamiltonian.

value of $\pi_\phi, f_\pm$ will be approximately

$$\int_C d\pi_\phi df_\pm |\langle \epsilon, 0 | \pi_\phi, f_\pm \rangle|^2 (1 + O(L^{-1})), \quad (6. 14)$$

provided that the distance between the initial point $(\epsilon, 0)$ and $\pi_\phi, f_\pm$ is much larger than L .

Next we need to calculate the quantity $|\langle \epsilon, 0 | \pi_\phi, f_\pm \rangle|^2$. We may estimate it taking into account the following considerations. For a general family of coherent states we write the norm of the overlap kernel $|\langle z | z' \rangle|^2$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle z | z' \rangle|^2 &= \left| \int dz_1 dz_2 \dots dz_n \langle z | z_1 \rangle \langle z_2 | z_3 \rangle \dots \langle z_n | z' \rangle \right|^2 \\ &< \int dz_1 dz_2 \dots dz_n |\langle z | z_1 \rangle \langle z_2 | z_3 \rangle \dots \langle z_n | z' \rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6. 15)$$

For a large number of time-steps the above expression may be expressed as a path integral. At the continuous ‘time’ limit we may consider that $z'_i = z_i + \delta z_i$, in which case $|\langle z_i | z_i + \delta z_i \rangle|^2 = e^{-2\delta s_i^2}$, in terms of the infinitesimal distance determined by the phase space metric. Hence,

$$|\langle z | z' \rangle|^2 < \int \prod dz_i e^{-2\sum_i \delta s_i^2} := \int D z(\cdot) e^{-2L^2(z(\cdot))}, \quad (6. 16)$$

where the summation is over all paths $z(\cdot)$ joining z and z' , and $L(\cdot)$ is the length of the path $z(\cdot)$. Within the saddle point approximation we may write then

$$|\langle z | z' \rangle|^2 < c e^{-2D^2(z, z')}, \quad (6. 17)$$

where c is a constant of order unity, and D^2 is the distance function on the manifold, corresponding to the length of the geodesic joining z and z' .

For the study of the R-W minisuperspace model, we are especially interested in the curve joining the point $(\epsilon, 0) \in U_<$ with the point $(0, f_-) \in U_>$. Since the regions $U_<$ and $U_>$ are only connected at the surface $\pi_\phi = \pm \sqrt{|U_{min}|}$, then,

$$D^2[(\epsilon, 0), (0, f_-)] = D^2[(\epsilon, 0), (\sqrt{|U_{min}|}, v)] + D^2[(\sqrt{|U_{min}|}, v), (0, f_-)], \quad (6. 18)$$

for some point on the surface $\pi_\phi = \pm \sqrt{|U_{min}|}$ characterised by the value v of the coordinate $f_\pm$.

The second distance can be calculated using the metric Eq. (5. 12) and reads

$$D^2[(\sqrt{|U_{min}|}, v), (0, f_-)] = \frac{1}{2} [|U_{min}| + (f_- - v)^2]. \quad (6. 19)$$

The first distance concerns a path in $U_<$ and should be calculated by using the metric Eq. (5. 14). However,

$$(1 + \frac{4\pi_\phi^2}{|U'(l_{1,2})|^2}) \delta \pi_\phi^2 \geq \delta \pi_\phi^2, \quad (6. 20)$$

so that

$$D^2[(\epsilon, 0), (\sqrt{|U_{min}|}, v)] > \frac{1}{2}[|U_{min}| + v^2], \quad (6.21)$$

whence

$$D^2[(\epsilon, 0), (0, f_-)] > |U_{min}| + \frac{1}{2}[v^2 + (v - f_-)^2] \geq |U_{min}| + f_-^2. \quad (6.22)$$

It follows that

$$|\langle \epsilon, 0 | \pi_\phi, f_\pm \rangle|^2 < ce^{-(2/3)^3/\Lambda^2 - f_-^2} < ce^{-(2/3)^3/\Lambda^2}. \quad (6.23)$$

Hence we have estimated an upper bound to the probability of 'tunnelling' from a universe of radius very close to one, to a universe at the onset of inflation. Note that such a formula makes sense only for coarse-grained histories at a phase space scale $L \gg 1$ and a distance D^2 on phase space much larger than L . It follows that $D^2[(\epsilon, 0), (0, f_-)]$ must be much larger than one, hence $\Lambda^2 \ll 1$. Clearly, for a cosmological constant of the order of the Planck scale ($\Lambda \sim 1$), it would make no sense to discuss about tunnelling or a quasi-classical domain.

Our previous analysis has showed that the continuous-time decoherence functional may be constructed with specific initial states, in order to describe the scenario corresponding to the tunnelling initial proposal of the universe.

An interesting issue arises, whether it would be possible to extend the formalism to other initial conditions, most notably the Hartle-Hawking proposal of no-boundary. The formalism presented here cannot be immediately applied in this case. The reason is that the Hartle-Hawking initial condition forces the consideration of histories that do not correspond to a Lorentzian globally-hyperbolic metric, hence we do not have a straightforward Hamiltonian analysis of constraints and time evolution.

However, the history formalism is sufficiently versatile to allow for this scenario. The definition of histories only involves the postulate of a partial ordering that implements the causality. It is therefore applicable in principle to systems that have no Hamiltonian description, either classically or quantum mechanically. Such a generalisation should involve an enlarged description of classical histories for general relativity, in order to take into account the non-boundary four-metrics. More importantly it requires the identification of a different expression of the decoherence functional. Another, perhaps better alternative would be a decoherence functional describing a quantum growth process, similar to the one postulated in the causal set scheme [34]. This issue is at present under investigation.

7 Conclusions

In this paper we studied the quantisation of minisuperspace models within the framework of consistent histories. We showed that the histories description

preserves the notion of causal ordering at the level of the true degrees of freedom, both classically and quantum mechanically.

The key problem of minisuperspace models, compared to general relativity, is that the imposition of the symmetry of homogeneity and isotropy destroys the spacetime diffeomorphism symmetry of general relativity. This leads to a number of problems at both the classical and the quantum level.

Classically, one may retain some traces of the diffeomorphism symmetry at the level of the history reduced state space. However, this involves the introduction of a metric-dependent foliation, which is rather unnatural in the setting of the minisuperspace model, unlike the case of general relativity.

At the quantum level, the loss of general covariance implies that we have no reliable guide for the unique selection of a preferred representation for the history Hilbert space.

We proposed a version of reduced state space quantisation for the implementation of constraints, a procedure that was facilitated by the key role played by coherent states in the construction of the history Hilbert space. This procedure allows us to implement the constraints at the quantum mechanical level, to construct the decoherence functional, and thus to estimate probabilities for interesting physical processes—such as the ‘tunnelling’ scenario for the initial state of the universe.

An important result was that the quantisation procedure removes from the physical Hilbert space all traces of the singular points of the classical theory—the ones that render the reduced state space into an orbifold.

Acknowledgements

Research was supported by a Marie Curie Reintegration Grant of the European Commission and a Pythagoras I grant from the Hellenic Ministry of Education. Also, C. A. gratefully acknowledges support from the Empirikion Foundation.

References

- [1] Ntina Savvidou, *General relativity histories theory I: The spacetime character of the canonical description*, Class.Quant.Grav. 21 (2004) 615.
- [2] Ntina Savvidou. *General relativity histories theory II: Invariance groups*, Class.Quant.Grav. 21 (2004) 631.
- [3] R. Griffiths, *Consistent quantum theory*, (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- [4] R. Omnès, *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994); *Consistent Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 64, 339, (1992).

- [5] R Omnés, *Understanding Quantum Mechanics*, (Princeton University Press, 1999).
- [6] M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle, *Quantum mechanics in the Light of Quantum Cosmology*, in *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, edited by W. Zurek, (Addison Wesley, Reading, 1990).
- [7] J. B. Hartle, *Spacetime Quantum Mechanics and the Quantum Mechanics of Spacetime*, in Proceedings on the 1992 Les Houches School, Gravitation and Quantisation, (1993).
- [8] C. J. Isham, *Canonical Quantum gravity and the Problem of Time* in GIFT Seminar 1992, 0157-288, gr-qc/9210011.
- [9] K. Kuchar. *Time and Interpretations of Quantum Gravity, Winnipeg 1991, Proceedings, General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, 211.
- [10] C.J. Isham, *Quantum Logic and the Histories Approach to Quantum Theory*, J. Math. Phys. 35, 2157, (1994).
- [11] C.J. Isham and N. Linden, *Quantum Temporal Logic and Decoherence Functionals in the Histories Approach to Generalised Quantum Theory*, J. Math. Phys. 35, 5452, (1994).
- [12] C.J. Isham and N. Linden. *Continuous Histories and the History Group in Generalised Quantum Theory*, J. Math. Phys. 36: 5392, (1995).
- [13] C. Isham, N. Linden, K. Savvidou and S. Schreckenberg, *Continuous time and consistent histories*, J. Math. Phys. 37, 2261, (1998).
- [14] K. Savvidou, *The action operator in continuous time histories*, J. Math. Phys. 40, 5657, (1999);
K. Savvidou; *Continuous Time in Consistent Histories*. PhD Thesis in gr-qc/9912076, (1999).
- [15] K. Savvidou. *Poincaré invariance for continuous-time histories*. J. Math. Phys. 43, 3053, 2002.
- [16] K. Savvidou and C. Anastopoulos, *Histories quantisation of parametrised systems: I. Development of a general algorithm*, Class. Quant. Grav. 17, 2463, (2000).
- [17] N. Savvidou, *General Relativity Histories Theory: Spacetime Diffeomorphisms and the Dirac Algebra of Constraints*, Class. Quant. Grav. 18, 3611, (2001).
- [18] J. J. Halliwell, *Trajectories for the Wave Function of the Universe from a Simple Detector Model*, Phys. Rev. D64, 044008, (2001); J.J. Halliwell and J. Thorwart, *Life in an Energy Eigenstate: Decoherent Histories Analysis of a Model Timeless Universe*, Phys. Rev. D65, 104009, (2002).

- [19] A. Vilenkin, *Quantum creation of universes*, Phys. Rev. D 30, 509, (1984).
- [20] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, *Wave Function of the Universe*, Phys. Rev. D 28, 2960, (1983).
- [21] C. Anastopoulos, *Continuous-time Histories: Observables, Probabilities, Phase Space Structure and the Classical Limit*, J.Math.Phys. 42, 3225, (2001).
- [22] J. R. Klauder and B. Skagerstam (editors), *Coherent States: Applications in Physics and Mathematical Physics*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).
- [23] A. Perelomov, *Generalized Coherent States and their Applications*, (Springer, Berlin, 1986).
- [24] C. Anastopoulos, *Quantum Processes on Phase Space*, Ann.Phys. 303, 270 (2003).
- [25] A. Burch, *Histories Electromagnetism*, J.Math. Phys. 45, 2153, (2004).
- [26] C. Anastopoulos and N. Savvidou, *The Role of Phase Space Geometry in Heisenberg's Uncertainty Relations*, Ann. Phys. 308, 329, (2003).
- [27] J. R. Klauder, *Coherent State Quantization of Constraint Systems*, Annals Phys. 254, 419, (1997).
- [28] A. Kempf and J. R. Klauder, *On the Implementation of Constraints through Projection Operators*, Phys. A34, 1019 (2001).
- [29] J. B. Hartle and D. Marolf, *Comparing Formulations of Generalized Quantum Mechanics for Reparametrization-Invariant Systems*, Phys.Rev. D56, 6247, (1997).
- [30] C. Anastopoulos, *Reduced state space quantisation and coherent state path integrals*, (in preparation).
- [31] J. R. Klauder and I. Daubechies, *Quantum Mechanical Path Integrals with Wiener Measures for all Polynomial Hamiltonians*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 1161 (1984); I. Daubechies and J. R. Klauder, *Quantum Mechanical Path Integrals with Wiener Measures for all polynomial Hamiltonians: 2*, J. Math. Phys. 26, 2239, (1985).
- [32] J. R. Klauder, *Quantization is Geometry, After All*, Ann. Phys. 188, 120, 1988; *Geometric Quantization from a Coherent State Viewpoint*, quant-ph/9510008.
- [33] R. Omnés, *Logical Reformulation of Quantum Mechanics: 4. Projectors in Semiclassical Physics*, J. Stat. Phys. 57, 357, 1989.
- [34] D. P. Rideout and R. D. Sorkin, *A Classical Sequential Growth Dynamics for Causal Sets*, Phys.Rev. D61, 024002, (2000).